United Nations A/55/PV.104

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session

Official Records

104th plenary meeting
Friday, 22 June 2001, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Holkeri ..... (Finland)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Shihab (Maldives), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

Agenda item 8 (*continued*)

Adoption of the agenda and organization of work: request for the inclusion of an additional item

Sixth report of the General Committee (A/55/250/Add.5)

The Acting President: I would like to draw the attention of the representatives to the sixth report of the General Committee, document A/55/250/Add.5, concerning a request by Nigeria for the inclusion in the agenda of an additional item.

In the report the General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that an additional item, entitled "Appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations", should be included in the agenda of the current session.

May I take it that the General Assembly decides to include in the agenda of the current session this additional item?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: The General Committee further decided to recommend that the additional item should be considered directly in plenary meeting.

May I take it that the General Assembly decides to consider this item directly in the plenary meeting?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 42 (*continued*)

Special session of the General Assembly in 2001 for follow-up to the World Summit for Children

Draft resolution (A/55/L.85)

The Acting President: The draft resolution before the Assembly was recommended for adoption by the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly on Children.

We shall now proceed to consider draft resolution A/55/L.85.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/55/L.85, entitled "Organizational arrangements for the round tables for the special session of the General Assembly on children".

May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt draft resolution A/55/L.85?

Draft resolution A/55/L.85 was adopted (resolution 55/276).

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 42.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

01-42550 (E)

Agenda item 179 (*continued*)

Review of the problem of human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immunodeficiency syndrome in all its aspects

List of civil society organizations not in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council seeking accreditation to the special session of the General Assembly on HIV/AIDS, including in the preparatory process (HIV/AIDS/CRP.2/Add.2)

The Acting President: The General Assembly will now take action on several pending matters concerning the special session of the General Assembly on HIV/AIDS.

I first draw the attention of members to Conference Room Paper HIV/AIDS/CRP.2/Add.2, in English only.

Members will recall that the Assembly, at its 93rd plenary meeting, on 26 February 2001, and at its 100th plenary meeting, on 18 May 2001, had approved the complementary list of relevant civil society actors that do not hold consultative status with the Economic and Social Council nor are members of the Programme Coordinating Board of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) seeking accreditation to the special session of the General Assembly on HIV/AIDS, as contained in documents HIV/AIDS/CRP.2 and its corrigendum 1 as well as addendum 1, all in English only.

Document HIV/AIDS/CRP.2/Add.2 contains the names of two organizations that complied with the deadline for accreditation but were inadvertently not included in the list.

The Assembly will now take a decision on the two organizations as contained in Conference Room Paper HIV/AIDS/CRP.2/Add.2 that do not hold consultative status with the Economic and Social Council nor are members of the Programme Coordination Board on HIV/AIDS seeking accreditation to the special session of the General Assembly on HIV/AIDS.

May I take it that the Assembly decides to approve the two organizations as contained in the Conference Room Paper HIV/AIDS/CRP.2/Add.2 that do not hold consultative status with the Economic and Social Council nor are members of the Programme Coordination Board on HIV/AIDS seeking accreditation to the special session of the General Assembly on HIV/AIDS?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: Next, I invite the attention of members to a matter relating to the list of selected accredited civil society actors for participation in the debate in plenary of the special session on HIV/AIDS and in the four round tables.

In paragraph 16 of General Assembly resolution 55/242 of 27 February 2001, the President of the General Assembly is requested, following appropriate consultations with Member States, to present the list of selected accredited civil society actors to Member States for consideration on a non-objection basis for final decision by the Assembly. The President is also requested to ensure that such selection is made on an equal and transparent basis, taking into account the principle of equitable geographical representation, relevant expertise and a wide variety of perspectives.

In paragraph 30 of General Assembly resolution 55/242, the President of the General Assembly is requested to conduct appropriate consultations with Member States and also with accredited civil society actors before presenting a list of selected accredited civil society actors that may participate in each round table to Member States for consideration on a non-objection basis for final decision by the General Assembly.

When selecting civil society actors, due consideration shall be given to the principles of equitable geographical representation and gender, as well as to an adequate mix of national, regional and international civil society actors to ensure that a variety of perspectives are represented.

In this connection, I wish to recall for members a letter dated 13 June 2001 from the President of the General Assembly to all Permanent Representatives to the United Nations presenting a list of civil society actors for participation in the debate of the plenary and in the round tables of the special session to Member States for accreditation on a non-objection basis for final decision by the General Assembly.

The UNAIDS secretariat has informed the office of the President of the following corrections to be

made to the list submitted by the President to Member States in his letter of 13 June 2001.

For the debate in plenary, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies is an observer with the General Assembly and is one of the observers already accredited to make a statement in the plenary. Consequently, it should be deleted from the list.

As concerns round table No. 2, the Congressional Black Caucus was inadvertently placed on the list. It should be replaced by the San Francisco AIDS Foundation. Africa Action was previously known as the Africa Fund. The organization adopted its current name on 26 February 2001.

As for round table No. 3, Eskom and Unilever PLC should be replaced by the Global Business Council on HIV/AIDS.

I should like to inform Member States that all of the replacement organizations are duly accredited to the special session. If there is no objection, may I take it that the General Assembly takes note of these corrections?

It was so decided.

Action on the list of selected civil society actors for participation in the debate in plenary

The Acting President: We will now proceed to take action on the list, as orally corrected and as revised by the President's letter dated 21 June 2001.

List of accredited civil society actors to participate in the debate in the plenary

The Acting President: I will now read out the list of selected, accredited civil society actors for participation in the debate in plenary and in the round tables: International Community of Women Living with HIV/AIDS; International Centre for Research on Women; Global Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS; Global Business Council on HIV/AIDS; Inter-Parliamentary Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU); Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches; International AIDS Society; International Council of AIDS Service Organizations. In round table 1: Global Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS; International AIDS Vaccine Initiative; Merck and Company, Incorporated; Malaysian AIDS Council; Latin American Harm Reduction Network; International AIDS Society; The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation; Médecins sans frontières. Round table 2: Asia Pacific Council of AIDS Service Organizations; Francois-Xavier Bagnoud Centre for Health and Human Rights; OASIS; San Francisco AIDS Foundation; AIDS Law Project; Lawyers' Collective HIV/AIDS Unit; Africa Action. Round table 3: ActionAID; Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development; International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; Global Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS; Caritas Internationalis; Environment and Development Action in the Third World (Enda Tiers Monde); Global Business Council on HIV/AIDS. Round table 4: The AIDS Support Organization; International HIV/AIDS Alliance; Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation; Harvard AIDS Institute of Harvard University; Population Council; The Coca-Cola Company; African Services Committee; African Council of AIDS Service Organizations.

I now would like to give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. Hynes (Canada): On the matter before us, my delegation would like to introduce a proposal on behalf of a number of other delegations. May I do that from my desk, or do I need to come to the podium?

The Acting President: From your desk.

Mr. Hynes (Canada): Thank you, Mr. President.

The Acting President: Egypt has asked for a point of order. I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Roshdy (Egypt): We came here guided by today's *Journal*, which is telling us that there are two items on the agenda. The first of these items has already been adopted; the second one has also been adopted. So what is the procedure now? What are we discussing? And how can we discuss something that is not in the agenda and something about which the Member States were not informed in advance?

The Acting President: I see here in the *Journal* that we do have a second agenda item, which reads "Review of the problem of human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immunodeficiency syndrome in all its aspects". This is what we are discussing now.

Mr. Roshdy (Egypt): Yes, you are right, Sir, but the item continues. It says: "HIV/AIDS/CRP.2/Add.2". This is what we just adopted. Clearly, it says that we are discussing that which we just adopted. So what comes next?

The Acting President: Actually, what we are discussing now is the second agenda item listed in the *Journal*. The document that we had adopted was the one that you mentioned. The discussion of the second item is not finished.

I call on the representative of Egypt on a point of order.

Mr. Roshdy (Egypt): I am sorry to be prolonging this, but I still need a clarification as to why this reference to the document has appeared in the *Journal*, why the *Journal* is making a clear reference to a certain document. Usually, when we see a reference to a document, it means that we are invited to consider this document. This is not just, say, agenda item 179. This is not shown on the agenda. The agenda says item 179 and then makes a clear reference to a certain document under this item. This is what we are here to consider. It did not say just item 179.

The Acting President: As I said before, apparently we are discussing the second agenda item. Under that item we also have to make a final decision on this, according to resolution 55/242. There is no other time at which we can take a decision on this, because the special session will begin, as the Assembly knows, on Monday. So the list has to be approved today.

I call on the representative of Egypt on a point of order.

Mr. Roshdy (Egypt): I still believe that we have just approved the list. We approved one list, and the second, and we approved the addendum for this list. So I think that we have just approved the list.

The Acting President: We have just presented the list, and we have not yet taken a final decision on it.

I call on the representative of Canada on a point of order.

Mr. Hynes (Canada): Of course, my delegation and those for which I speak are in your hands, Sir, but the situation is straightforward from our perspective. We are dealing with the second item listed in the *Journal*. You, as President have put forward a proposal, and I now want to take the floor to propose a motion which would be tantamount to an amendment to that proposal. If I may do that I will proceed with my statement.

The Acting President: I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya on a point of order.

Mr. Barg (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): We have not yet settled the issue of what we are dealing with here in the General Assembly. We would like to support what was mentioned by the representative of Egypt. We were wondering what kind of decision we are going to take and relating to what issue. We have not been previously informed, either in today's *Journal* or elsewhere, that we are meeting here in the General Assembly to take a decision on an issue that is not mentioned in the *Journal*.

We are not here in informal/informals. We are in a formal meeting, taking a decision about which we have not been informed and the content of which we do not know. It is common practice for our delegations to get in touch with capitals to take a specific stand on any decision put forward for discussion in the General Assembly. Consequently, I do not think that there is any issue under discussion since delegations were not previous given notice of it. We do not even have time to prepare for the discussion of such a decision.

Everything is very clearly mentioned in today's *Journal*. This is why we object to our proceeding in this manner. The rules are very clear in this connection; normally this is what we do, and this is what we have been doing for many years.

Therefore, I reiterate my point. Of course we know that we are short of time, but this is a transient phenomenon, as it were, and we cannot as representatives take a stand on an issue for which we have not prepared ourselves and the content of which we do not really know. As I have just said, we are dealing with a serious issue, and our knowledge about it will not be transmitted to us by divine powers. This is what I have to say, and I may wish to take the floor again at a later stage.

The Acting President: With regard to what was just said by the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, as I said when we started discussing this agenda item, I mentioned a letter of the President of 21

June, which says that the list will be presented to Member States for consideration on a non-objection basis for final decision by the General Assembly, as in resolution 55/242. And this is the list which has been presented now. As the Assembly knows, the special session is starting just on Monday morning. I therefore appeal to the Assembly as follows: in order to approve this list we should try to continue with the discussion and arrive at a final decision on this list. Otherwise, for the very important special session we are having, starting on Monday, we may not be able to really fulfil the objectives that we are trying to reach at that session.

I give the floor to the representative of Qatar on a point of order.

Mr. Al-Sulaiti (Qatar) (*spoke in Arabic*): In accordance with rule 77 of our rules of procedure, my delegation would like to propose postponing discussion of the item before us until we get a written legal opinion from the legal services of the United Nations.

The Acting President: I give the floor to the representative of Sweden on a point of order.

Ms. Mårtensson (Sweden): On behalf of Sweden and the European Union, I have to say that the previous interventions are very confusing. I do fully agree that it would have been better if there had been more transparency and if there had been a notice in the *Journal* that we were going to take a decision on the list this afternoon. However, those delegations that claim they have not been informed were in fact informed yesterday by the Secretariat, and we discussed this issue even further today.

This issue is at the same time being mixed with the issue of whether or not we have actually adopted a list, but that is a completely different matter. As you stated, Sir, we have not adopted it yet. We were just at the point where you started to introduce that list. Another point is that Canada was on the way to making a motion, and according to the rules of procedure, any member of the General Assembly may do so if they so wish. I also wanted to ask about the very last point; I do not understand the request for a legal opinion. Perhaps it would simplify matters for the Office of Legal Affairs if we knew what the question was. So far, I have heard several different questions that point in completely different directions. Perhaps, Mr. President, you could guide us through this process.

The Acting President: Rule 76 says,

> "During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the suspension or the adjournment of the meeting. Such motions shall not be debated but shall be immediately put to the vote. The President may limit the time to be allowed to the speaker moving the suspension or adjournment of the meeting."

If there is no objection, I intend to suspend the meeting.

I would like to bring to the attention of the whole Assembly that we are now taking up all matters which come under a point of order.

I call on the representative of Canada on a point of order.

Mr. Hynes (Canada): I very much regret having to engage in this procedural discussion. I am looking forward to an opportunity to simply say my peace, and then enable the Assembly to proceed with its important business so that we do not have to deal with this very important question on Monday morning in the presence of our ministers, heads of Government and heads of State. I think that would be a very unbecoming start to the special session.

My point of order relates to the initial intervention on the part of Egypt, questioning what we are talking about. You clarified very well, Sir, that we are dealing with the second agenda item listed in the *Journal* today, on the review of the HIV/AIDS issue, and you made it clear that you had put a proposal before the Assembly under that item. The interventions I have heard at this point —

The Acting President: I am sorry. We can talk only about the suspension now.

Mr. Hynes (Canada): I just wish to note that there is a prior procedural issue on the table, and that is a challenge by the delegations of Egypt and others to your initial ruling that we are dealing with legitimate General Assembly business. Challenges to the rulings of the Chair, pursuant to rule 71, are to be put to an immediate vote. We are prepared to vote either on the challenge or on the suspension, and we oppose the suspension at this point because we do not have time. However, what we do think we are dealing with here is a challenge to the ruling of the Acting President.

The Acting President: I give the floor to the representative of Egypt on a point of order.

Mr. Roshdy (Egypt): I am sorry I have to draw your attention to rule 71 of the rules of procedure, which states, "A representative rising to a point of order may not speak on the substance of the matter under discussion." We have just heard a discussion of the substance.

The Acting President: I give the floor to the representative of Canada on a point of order.

Mr. Hynes (Canada): I and the delegations on whose behalf I am speaking want to be of every possible assistance to you, Sir, in resolving this matter. So, we are prepared to go along with your suggestion of suspension right now so that we can try to sort it out.

The meeting was suspended at 4.20 p.m. and resumed at 6.10 p.m.

The Acting President: We will proceed now with the agenda item we were discussing when we suspended the meeting.

I give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. Hynes (Canada): I am speaking on behalf of the delegations of Canada and Norway. The following delegations have also associated themselves with this intervention: Andorra, Australia, Chile, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand and San Marino.

I would like at this stage to propose an amendment to the proposal which you, Sir, had orally read out to the Assembly before we took this break. This is a course of action which my delegation and others had signalled we would be raising during the informal consultations chaired this morning by the President's facilitator, Ambassador Ka.

Just as a bit of background, I would refer to the two letters from the President of the General Assembly to all delegations on the matter before us. You have already referred to those. In the first instance, on 13 June, he proposed a list of civil society actors to participate in the plenary and in the round-table discussions during the special session. In the second instance, only yesterday, 21 June, the President advised delegations that he had been informed by 11 delegations of objections to the participation in the round table on human rights of a representative of the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission.

After lengthy informal discussions this morning, it became apparent that the office of the President is not in a position to divulge the identities of the objecting delegations; nor is it able to enlighten the Assembly as to the nature or the basis of those objections. Nor, it seems, were any of the objecting delegations able — or willing — to share any such information with other members of the Assembly.

In those circumstances, our delegations consider that they do not have sufficient information to enable them to make an informed decision to exclude that representative from the list of civil society actors who would participate in the human rights round table. In that regard, we would note that the organization in question had already been duly accredited to the special session by an earlier decision of the Assembly, and we would add that the only basis on which my delegation could agree to its exclusion from the list would be the presentation of clear evidence to the effect that that organization had engaged in activities contrary to the fundamental purposes and principles of the United Nations. At this stage, no such evidence has been adduced — and, indeed, no such allegations have even been advanced.

Consequently, our delegations would now wish to formally move that the name of Karyn Kaplan of the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission be included in the list of civil society actors to participate in the round table on human rights during the special session.

I want to emphasize very strongly that our delegations regret very much that it has become necessary to take this measure, and we have proceeded only following very thorough reflection and only after having reached the conclusion that at least two considerations dictate this course of action.

First, throughout the preparatory process, in discussions on both procedural and substantive aspects of our work, it has been frequently and widely stated, and agreed by all, that this special session can succeed and the battle against HIV/AIDS can be effective only if a genuine effort is made to engage the relevant quarters of civil society in the process and in the battle. If we wish the world to regard the special session as a serious effort to contribute to this cause, our actions here today must reflect those words and that reality.

Secondly, the time when it might have been considered acceptable for groups or organizations to

deny important rights or privileges to people on the basis of anonymous arbitrary blackballing is, happily, a long-gone era in our respective societies. Furthermore, our delegations have never considered that such practices are appropriate in the context of the United Nations.

Consequently, we request that our motion for the reinstatement of this group now be taken up by the Assembly, and we would urge all other delegations to join in taking this step to preserve the integrity of the special session and of the Assembly. We would request further that this motion be considered through a recorded vote. We would assume that, following a decision on that motion, the Assembly would be in a position to take a decision on the entire list that the Acting President has read out.

Mr. Roshdy (Egypt): Guided by rule 67 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, I humbly appeal to the Acting President to check whether we have a quorum sufficient for the Assembly to take any action.

The Acting President: In order to ascertain the presence of delegations in the Hall, I would request all delegations that are here to press the green button on their desks.

The total is 86 delegations, 9 short of a quorum.

I call on the representative of Canada on a point of order.

Mr. Hynes (Canada): My delegation was quite prepared to concur with the proposed method of counting in the interest of efficiency, but I would request that the quorum be counted by a headcount, because I observed some delegations that were in the Hall but that did not press the button. Thus, I do not think that the electronic count is an accurate reflection of the number of delegations present.

The Acting President: I call on the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Roshdy (Egypt): I think it is unheard of to have a headcount. If a delegation is present in the Hall and does not wish to press the button, it means that that delegation does not want its presence to be acknowledged. It is up to a representative whether or not to push the button. If I do not push the button, it means that I do not want to participate in this process, so I am not present. I am afraid I will have to ask the Secretariat not to make any connotations while I am making my intervention — otherwise, this would be a very dangerous precedent.

The Acting President: In the light of the comment made by Egypt, I would like to ask the delegation of Canada whether it is making a formal request for a headcount.

Mr. Hynes (Canada): I am in the hands of the Acting President, but I do not know if I have any option, frankly, because the second sentence of rule 67 states clearly that the presence of a majority of the members shall be required for any decision to be taken, not that a majority of members must push the button. I have observed that there are some delegations that are present and that did not push the button. I will be happy to have those delegations abstain on my amendment in due course. But if they are here, then they need to be counted as part of the quorum.

The Acting President: I call on the representative of Egypt on a point of order.

Mr. Roshdy (Egypt): Because a headcount is of course unheard of, may I ask the representative of Canada, through the Acting President, if it would be by hand or by call. If, for example, the President calls on Egypt, and we are present, and neither I nor my colleagues say we are present and we just maintain silence, does this mean that we are present or does this mean that we are absent? If this is the will of the Member States, in my interpretation we would be absent, because we can just simply move out of this Hall and come back 15 minutes after the count. So there is no quorum.

Mr. Chaudhry (Pakistan): We are indeed disappointed that we have begun in the first place to consider an item that was not on our agenda. As is clearly evident, the *Journal* does not show it, and we had to spend three hours discussing it. We could not even benefit from the legal advice. I do not know what the legal department is for if it cannot really guide us in such matters.

Procedures are being violated one after another. We began consideration of an item on which there was a clear dispute, and now we are being subjected to innovative ways of counting. One is reminded of the Florida recount. It is really getting outrageous. If this continues, if the procedures are not to be respected, I guess there will be many delegations that will have to

disassociate themselves from this process and will have to go out, as Egypt proposed. We will probably have to go out, because otherwise the best course is to stay and follow the procedures, not to introduce new items and new situations.

The Acting President: I thank all the speakers who have just addressed the Assembly, and I ask that we be very rational. As Acting President, I am left at the disposal of the Assembly. Members are the Assembly. They decide what is to be done. But I am also advised by the legal department, and I am trying to do my best to conduct this meeting in a legal way that has precedents. I am trying not to create any new incidents. Please bear with me. This time I would like again to really suspend the meeting for five minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 6.25 p.m. and resumed at 6.50 p.m.

The Acting President: According to rule 67, since there is no quorum for a decision, but there is a quorum for the discussion of the agenda item before us, if there are any representatives who wish to make statements, we will continue with the 104th plenary meeting.

I call on the representative of Egypt on a point of order.

Mr. Roshdy (Egypt): I should simply like to ask for a clarification. May I know what your proposal is?

The Acting President: My proposal is to continue with the meeting and to allow those countries that wish to make statements to do so, but not to take action on any decision, because there is no quorum for it.

Ms. Mårtensson (Sweden): Sir, the procedure is somewhat confused, but I would like to take this opportunity, since you invited us to make statements, to make a statement on behalf of the European Union (EU), the Czech Republic, Cyprus, Hungary, Lithuania, Malta, Romania and Slovenia.

The main point of our intervention is that we would like support the motion made by Canada. We think it is very important that we take a decision whereby we would include the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, which has been removed from the list that was previously presented by the President of the General Assembly. We heard the reason for the removal in a letter from the President of the General Assembly dated 21 June. The reason given was that 11 Member States had objected to that group's participation.

All members of the General Assembly have previously stressed, in resolution 55/13 and elsewhere, the importance of the contribution of civil society actors in the response to the epidemic, and the need for their active involvement in the special session. On this basis, and based on the particular experience of the organization in question, the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission was accredited by the General Assembly so that it could participate in both the preparatory activities and the special session. After consultations with the Member States and accredited civil society actors, and based on the criteria given in resolution 55/242 — to which you previously referred, Sir — the President of the General Assembly made his recommendation on the participation of civil society actors in the debate in the plenary and the four round tables. Due to the objection of 11 anonymous Member States, that organization was, however, removed from the list.

We would like to state that the EU and the others that have supported this statement cannot accept this type of procedure, whereby organizations are not allowed to speak, to make their voices heard, to add their points of view. We feel even more strongly about this position after hearing what we have heard today. We are very, very disturbed by this opposition to freedom of expression that has been expressed here today.

Until now the General Assembly has not been provided with any information that would lead us to question our opinion that this organization would have the relevant expertise to make a valuable contribution to round table 2. In the informal consultations that preceded this meeting, we appealed in vain to the representatives of those delegations that had objected to that organization's participation to come forward and provide us with information regarding the basis of their objections.

Therefore, we have no choice but to support the motion by Canada to take a decision to add this organization to the list. Unfortunately, as it is quite clear that we are not in a position to achieve a consensus decision, we also support the idea of taking the decision by recorded vote.

Mr. Chaudhry (Pakistan): At the outset, I must say that my delegation, like many other delegations, attaches great importance to the success of this special session. We are committed to its success, and we want to work together for its success.

Mr. Barg (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya): I should sincerely and from the bottom of my heart apologize to my dear colleague and brother from Pakistan for interrupting him.

We would like a very clear clarification. Are we discussing the substance of a proposal that has not been put to a vote? If we are doing this, my second point is that any proposal of a substantive nature has to be put to the General Assembly in writing and time has to be given — 24 hours, according to the rules — for Member States to study the proposal and act upon it. My delegation cannot go along with the idea of discussing proposals that have not been either acted upon or circulated. Therefore, this discussion is really useless. And my delegation opposes this kind of discussion on the merits of a proposal that we vaguely heard about just now.

The Acting President: Rule 78 reads,

> "Proposals and amendments shall normally be submitted in writing to the Secretary-General, who shall circulate copies to the delegations."

I have been told that there have been incidents in which this procedure has not been strictly followed; as a general rule this procedure has been followed. I should say that as a general rule it says that we shall not proceed if there are any objections.

Mr. Barg (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya): I am sorry to take the floor again, but as I have said and will repeat, this is what the Secretariat has been advising us about exceptions; exceptions are not the rule. Secondly, exceptions do not pertain to questions of a substantive nature. This is a very substantive question, and it has to be treated as such.

The Acting President: Should I understand this to be an objection?

Mr. Barg (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya): Yes.

The Acting President: We are on the issue of the objection of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

Mr. Hynes (Canada): I do regret that we are back into these procedural discussions. I thought that you, Sir, had wanted to give delegations a chance to comment on the substance of the questions before us. But I would require clarification as to the precise nature of the objection from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. If he is objecting to the Assembly's taking action on proposals that have not been presented in writing 24 hours in advance, then that objection would have to pertain to the proposed course of action, the proposed list that you read to us this afternoon, as well as to the Canadian amendment, of course. If we are going to proceed on that basis, my delegation will be more than prepared to submit a written text for consideration in due course. I assume that would be Monday morning, in the presence of our ministers and dignitaries.

The Acting President: As I have stated before, there is not even a quorum to decide on anything. Therefore, I will adjourn this meeting. The next meeting will be announced in the *Journal*.

The meeting rose at 7.05 p.m.